



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 2450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,671	10/15/2003	Dieter Eckardt	ECKARDT-5	7049
20151	7590	09/26/2006	EXAMINER	
HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
350 FIFTH AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 4714			PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10118			2164	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/685,671	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ECKARDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Phuong-Thao Cao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 07/05/2006.
2. Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended, and claim 2 has been canceled. Currently, claims 1 and 3-5 are pending.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "apparatus", with element 2 of Fig. 1, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A descriptive textual label for each numbered element in these figures would be needed to better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be labeled in the drawing. Optionally, the applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o), recited below:

"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible."

*Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07/05/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Okamoto discloses only a reception buffer aiding in the data conversion, but not a (permanent) parameter memory, Examiner disagrees. According to a computer dictionary, buffer is an memory area; in addition, a reception buffer taught by Okamoto as a place where reception data converted into parallel data are written or stored (see [column 12, lines 45-62]) wherein each of parallel data are equivalent to Applicant's "parameter"; therefore, reception buffer can be considered as a parameter memory. In the claimed invention, the Applicant does not specify the parameter memory as a permanent memory, so the parameter memory is interpreted as any memory area holding parameters.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto (US Patent No 5,754,531).

As to claim 1, Okamoto teaches:

“A method for parameterizing an apparatus” (see Abstract, [column 11, lines 45-65] and [column 16, lines 35-67] wherein sending a transmission demand, for instance “Drive the wiper”, is equivalent to Applicant’s “parameterizing an apparatus”), comprising the steps of:

“inputting a dataset having at least one parameter with a data input device that is connected with the apparatus via a datalink, the dataset including at least one parameter number and a parameter value” (see [column 16, lines 35-67] and [column 17, lines 1-40] wherein node A is equivalent to Applicant’s “data input device”, nodes B, C, D and E are equivalent to Applicant’s “apparatus”, communication frame is equivalent to Applicant’s “dataset” and bus line is equivalent to Applicant’s “datalink”; see [column 13, lines 30-45] and Fig 4 wherein communication frame is equivalent to Applicant’s “dataset” wherein destination address indicating destination of transmission is equivalent to Applicant’s “parameter number” and transmission data sequence indicating a data area to transmit is equivalent to Applicant’s “parameter value”);

“transmitting the inputted dataset to the apparatus” (see [column 16, lines 65-67] and [column 17, lines 1-3 and 30-40]);

“decomposing each dataset received at the apparatus into the at least one parameter number and the parameter value” (see [column 12, lines 49-55] wherein serial reception data is

equivalent to Applicant's "dataset", and converting the data from serial data to parallel data is equivalent to decomposing as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"assigning to the at least one parameter number and the parameter value a memory address in a parameter memory based on the at least one parameter number" (see [column 12, lines 50-60] and [column 17, lines 55-67] wherein data "0100" is an example of parameter number, reception buffer register is equivalent to Applicant's "parameter memory", and determining an address of the reception buffer is equivalent to assigning a memory address as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"separately storing the at least one parameter number and the parameter at the memory address" (see [column 12, lines 55-60] wherein the disclosure of the reception data stored in the reception buffer as parallel data wherein each of parallel data is equivalent to a parameter value or number indicates separately storing different parameters);

"returning to the data input device the separately stored at least one parameter number and parameter value" (see [column 18, lines 15-25 and 44-60] wherein the master node A is equivalent to Applicant's "data input device", and reception data stored reception buffer register is equivalent to Applicant's "the separately stored at least one parameter number and parameter value");

"comparing at the data input device the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value with the corresponding transmitted at least one parameter number and parameter value of the input dataset" (see Abstract and [column 18, lines 45-60] wherein each of parallel data is equivalent to parameter number or parameter value, and data stored in the transmission

buffer register is equivalent Applicant's "corresponding transmitted at least one parameter number and parameter value of the input dataset"); and

"releasing the received dataset if the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value are identical to the corresponding ones of the inputted dataset" (see [column 17, lines 10-15] and [column 19, lines 18-40] wherein outputting data which are processed as effective as disclosed is equivalent to releasing the received dataset as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 3 this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Okamoto teaches:

"wherein comparing includes inverting a bit pattern of the received dataset, and inverting a bit pattern of the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value" (see [column 19, lines 53-65], [column 20, lines 45-67] and [column 21, lines 1-25] wherein reception data is equivalent both to "the received dataset" and "the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value", and inverted reception data is equivalent to "inverting a bit pattern" as illustrated in Applicant's claim language)

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Okamoto teaches:

“wherein comparing includes a visual comparison between the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value and the corresponding ones of the inputted dataset” (see [column 19, lines 25-40]) wherein the control system interface portion outputting data as effective in response to the control signal as disclosed shows a visual matching result of the comparison which is equivalent to Applicant’s “visual comparison”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Okamoto teaches:

“wherein comparing includes an automatic comparison between the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value and the corresponding ones of the inputted dataset” (see [column 18, lines 45-67] wherein data in the return data buffer register is equivalent to Applicant’s “the returned stored at least one parameter number and parameter value”, data in the transmission buffer register is equivalent to Applicant’s “the corresponding ones of inputted dataset” and the comparison operation of the comparison portion is equivalent to Applicant’s “automatic comparison”).



*Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

September 11, 2006

*John P. Wassum*  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 267